Speculum Sherlockianum:

OR, A

LOOKING-GLASS

In which the ADMIRERS of

Mr. Sherlock

may behold the Man, as to his Accuracy, Judgement, Orthodoxy.

Henry Hickman

By an Obedient Son of the Church of *ENGLAND.*

LONDON,

Printed for *Thomas Parkhurst* at the Three Crowns and Bible at the lower end of *Cheap-side*, near *Mercers-Chappell*, M. DC. LXXIV.

SIR,

YOu are pleaſed in your Letter *March* 24th. to counſel me to buy the Book called, *A Diſcourſe concerning the Knowledge of Jeſus Chriſt*, not queſtioning but by reading of it, I ſhall be brought to abate of the eſteem I have ſometime expreſſed of thoſe Divines who are therein refuted. Your counſel to buy the Book came ſomewhat too late, I had bought it ſundry weeks before, tempted ſo to do by its promiſing title and flattering my ſelf into a perſwaſion, that what was written by Mr. *W. S.* and Licenſed by Dr. *S. P.* muſt needs contain in it ſomewhat extraordinary. In this perſwaſion I was ſomewhat confirmed, becauſe I found the Author in the Preface averring that he had compoſed his Book not without imploring the guidance and direction of God. But having peruſed only his firſt Chapter, conſiſting of 13 pages; I found in them ſo much weakneſs, contradiction, and calumny, that I wiſh'd I had the Money I gave for the Book in my Pocket again.

Pag. 3. He ſaith, "The Goſpel of Chriſt is "as ſevere a diſpenſation as the Law which "dooms all men to eternal miſery, who live "not very innocent and virtuous lives, but the "Perſon of Chriſt is all Grace, a meer refuge "for the wicked and ungodly.

If theſe words expreſs his own mind, then have thoſe who ordained him, reaſon to wiſh they had laid their hands upon a thorn buſh, ra-

ther than imposed them on his head. If they are intended to represent the opinion of others whom he takes upon him to refute, or rather to deride, then must I needs for the present, look upon them as a calumny, being very confident that no one of them hath either Preached or Printed such things from which such desperate absurd opinions can be inferred.

Pag. 4. *Some men wherever they meet with the word Christ in Scripture, alwayes understand by it the Person of Christ.*

I have heard of some, that wherever they heard their Minister read the word *Jesus* in the New Testament, thought they were to understand by it, the *Redeemer of Mankind*, and therefore have devoutly bowed their Knees at the Name *Jesus*, when it signifyed *Joshua*, or him that was called *Justus*; but of any men who thought that the word Christ was alwayes in the New Testament to be understood of the *Person of Christ*, did I never till I read this Author here, and I believe he himself doth not think there are any such; if he do, why then doth he say *pag.* 11. that it is acknowledged by all, that *Christ* sometimes signifyes the *Church* of *Christ*. Let us frame a Syllogism, If it be acknowledged by all that the word *Christ* doth sometimes signifie *the Church*, then are there none who wherever they meet with the word *Christ* in Scripture, do alwayes understand it of the *Person of Christ*. But it is acknowledged by all, *&c. Ergo*, If you can answer this Syllogism, so as not to make your friend either to contradict himself, or calumniate others, then

shall

ſhall I confeſs my ſelf to be what you imagine, ſomewhat Melancholly, and to need a diverſion.

Ibid. *Chriſt is originally the name of an Office which the Jews call the Meſſias, or one anointed by God.*

That a concrete or connotative term ſhould be *originally the name of an Office*, ſeems to me very ſtrange and uncouth. All terms that are denominative, ſignifie two things; that which is denominated, and the form from which it is denominated; ſo muſt the word *Chriſt* needs ſignifie, and I deſpair of being referred to any place of Scripture where it ſignifies *an Office*, and not alſo *the Perſon inveſted with the Office*. But to ſay that the Jews call an Office the *Meſſias* (a word of a Greek termination) or one anointed by God, is to father ſuch a piece of prodigious Nonſence upon the Jews, as I dare ſay they would be loth to have laid at their doors. And yet this confident Gentleman takes upon him to give a reaſon of ſo groſs Nonſence in theſe words, *For under the Law, their Prophets, Prieſts, and Kings, were inveſted in their ſeveral Offices by the Ceremony of anointing them with Oyle.* I will not be ſo ſevere as to bring this reaſon into the form of an argumentation, leſt it ſhould create ſome horror in you: Make the words an intire or abſolute Propoſition, and you will not much fancy it; for indeed under the Law the *High-Prieſts* in regular times were *inveſted in their Office, with the Ceremony of anointing with Oyle*; but ſo were not the *inferiour Prieſts* at any time ſave only the firſt.

As for the *Prophets* under the Law, I cannot find that any one of them was *inveſted in his Prophetical Office by the Ceremony of anointing with Oyle* : which notwithſtanding, they might and perhaps were called, *the Lords anointed*, and ſo at this day may we call all Miniſters and Chriſtians, yet not becauſe they are anointed with Oyle ceremonially applyed to them when firſt they are put into the number of Miniſters or Chriſtians.

He adds, *That the legal unctions were typical of that divine unction the Holy Jeſus received at his baptiſm when the Spirit of God deſcended on him like a Dove*, and I think that *thoſe unctions were typical*, but doubt many of the *Jews* never underſtood their *typicalneſs*, and do not ſee why they ſhould be thought only to have typified the *anointing of Chriſt at his baptiſm*. He was *anointed with the Holy Ghoſt, and with power at his conception or incarnation*. But be this as it will, I am unſatisfied with what follows *page* the 5th. *That Gods anointing Chriſt with the Holy Ghoſt, and with power, ſhould be his conſecration to the Mediatory Office*. Dr. *Jackſon*, and Dr. *Hammond* ſing quite another Song, and tell us *Chriſt was conſecrated to his Prieſtly Office* (a part ſure of his Mediatory Office) *by his ſufferings and death*, and ſurely *Chriſt's dying*, was not his *being anointed with the Holy Ghoſt*. There follows ſomething *pag.* the 5th. which amazed me, for he ſaith *all thoſe Offices of Prophet, Prieſt, and King, are not properly diſtinct Offices in Chriſt, but the ſeveral parts and adminiſtrations of his Mediatory Kingdom.*

Do

Do not wonder if this put me into a little amazement for resolving it into three Propositions, I found every one of them strange. 'Tis strange presumption for a young Divine to say, that *these Offices are not distinct Offices in Christ*, and never in the least to suggest wherein the impropriety of so calling them doth lye. To find fault with forms of speech generally used, and which may be retained without any inconvenience, and never to tell us where the faultiness of those forms of speech lyes, does not become one who is minded to keep up a reputation of modesty. The second Proposition is yet more strange, *these Offices are not distinct Offices, but the several parts of Christ's Mediatory Kingdom*, as if they might not be distinct Offices, and yet parts. The third Proposition is yet strangest of all, *That these Offices are the several administrations of Christ's Mediatory Kingdom.* Is an *Office* an *administration*? Is the *Office* of a King but one *part* and *administration* of a Mediatory Kingdom? You are wiser than I, wherefore put me out of my wondering humour, and tell me what kind of *totum* a Mediatory Kingdom is to the *Offices* of *Prophet*, *Priest*, and *King*. And yet should you so do, I should not be cured of the admiring humour this Author hath put me into; for he tells me, ibid. *That Christ's preaching of the Gospel was his exercise of his regal Power and Authority in publishing his Laws, and the conditions of eternal life.* I can easily understand, that *to make and enact the Laws and conditions of eternal life, is an exercise of regal Power and Authority.* So is it also to constitute

and make Officers to promulge and publish Laws. But if bare publishing of Laws be the exercise of a regal Power and Authority, there will be more Kings in every Commonwealth, than were ever yet called by that name.

He adds ibid. *That our Saviour tells Pilate he was born to be a King*, quoting *Joh.* 18. *v.* 37. And yet our Saviour neither there, nor anywhere else useth any words of such an import, either unto *Pilate*, or any one else. Christ was not born to be a King, but was born a King. I had took no notice of this, but that I smelt a Socinian rat in it.

Pag. 6. "That to which we commonly ap-"propriate the name of Regal Power, is that "Authority which he is invested with to govern "his Church, to send his Spirit to forgive sins, "to dispense his grace and supernatural assi-"stances, to answer Prayers, to raise the dead, "and judge the world, and bestow immortal life "on all his sincere Disciples; all this is the "reward of his death, and sufferings, and is "therefore called his Intercession, because like "the intercession of the High-Priest, under the "Law it is founded on his expiation and sa-"crifice.

This is a strain of new Divinity, so new that perhaps the world never saw it in Print, till it was so unhappy as to be pestered with *Socinus*. All the things here spoken of do agree to *Christ* as *God-man*, yet so that the *Divine Nature* is chiefly to be eyed and to be look'd upon as the *principle* or *fountain*, the *humane Nature* affording

ing

ing only an *inferiour instrumental concurrence.* But why ſhould it be ſaid that all theſe are the *reward of Chriſts death and ſufferings?* Had he not the Authority for all from his incarnation? Did he not *raiſe from the dead,* and *forgive ſins,* and *diſpenſe his grace* and *ſupernatural aſſiſtances* before he dyed? what one place of Scripture is there that ſayes, *the power of forgiving ſins, or raiſing from the dead was a reward of Chriſts death and ſufferings?* And where did this Gentleman learn that all theſe things are call'd *the interceſſion of Chriſt, and therefore call'd his interceſſion becauſe founded on his expiation and ſacrifice?* Every thing that is a fruit of *Chriſts interceſſion* is not preſently in Scripture *called or to be called his interceſſion.* And he writes very looſely and wildly, *pag.* 7. when having quoted *Heb.* 9. 12. He adds, *ſo that interceſſion ſignifies the adminiſtration of Chriſts Mediatory Kingdom, the power of a Regal Prieſt to expiate and forgive ſins.* For neither doth *the interceſſion of Chriſt* ſo ſignifie, nor if it did ſo ſignifie, could ſuch a ſignification be collected from that place of Scripture where the word *interceſſion* is not uſed, nor any other word equivalent thereunto.

Pag. 8. "Though Chriſt is originally the "name of an Office, yet it is in Scripture uſed "to ſignifie the Perſon who is inveſted with "this Office.

This is a rare and odd notion, for as the word *Chriſt* never ſignifies the *Office abſtracted from the perſon,* ſo it never ſignifies the *Perſon, but as inveſted with the Office.* And he that can di-

ſtinguiſh

ſtinguiſh this ſecond acceptation of the word from the firſt, and make ſence of both, I think muſt be more ſubtile than *Doctor Subtilis* himſelf. What follows that, *the Lord before his deſignation to the Office was publickly owned, was only call'd Jeſus.* Either I do not underſtand, or elſe it is very falſe, for *when was our Lords deſignation to his Office publickly owned?* A man would think by what is added that this Authour thought it was *not publickly owned,* till he was *rais'd from the dead.* For theſe are his words, *In the Goſpels which contain the Hiſtory of his life and death, he is called Jeſus alwayes, becauſe all this time it was diſputed whether he was the Chriſt or no.* But I am ſure that the Goſpels contain the Hiſtory of his *reſurrection,* as well as of his *life* and *death*, and that he is not *alwayes in the Goſpel called Jeſus*, but he is called *Jeſus Chriſt* in the very firſt Verſe of St. *Matthew's Goſpel,* and that he was called *Chriſt* as well as *Jeſus* before his reſurrection, not only by his Diſciples, but by ſuch who had not courage or faith enough to become his Diſciples. Had it been otherwiſe, the *Iews* would not have thought it neceſſary to make a Law againſt thoſe who ſaid he was the *Chriſt.* The reaſon why the *Evangeliſts* uſe the name *Jeſus* more frequently than the name *Chriſt*, could not be becauſe in the life-time of *Chriſt* it was diſputed whether *Jeſus* were the *Chriſt*, for the Goſpels were all written after the *reſurrection of Chriſt*, and one of them was written after all *Paul's* Epiſtles were written, at which time there were many Churches founded

on

on this perſwaſion and belief, that *Jeſus* was the *Chriſt*.

Pag. 9. He acquaints us, *That Chriſt ſometimes ſignifies the Goſpel and Religion of Chriſt.* I think in the Sacred Scripture it doth ſometimes ſo ſignifie, but wiſh he had not brought *Col.* 2. 8. as an inſtance of that ſignification. The *Socinians* would be glad to have it convincingly proved that the word *Chriſt* is there uſed for *Chriſt's Doctrine and Religion*, or *Goſpel*, for ſo they would have it to ſignifie, and thence they infer that the words in the 9th Verſe are not a ſufficient argument to prove *Chriſt's Divinity*. 'Tis, ſay they, not the *humane Nature* of Chriſt, but *the Goſpel of Chriſt*, in which *the fulneſs of the Godhead dwelleth bodily*, and they prove it by ſo expounding the 8th Verſe, as Mr. *Sh.* expounds it.

I grant alſo that the word *Chriſt*, doth as he notes *pag.* 11. *ſometimes ſignifie the Church of Chriſt which is his body, the fulneſs of him that filleth all in all*: But I deny that we muſt thus underſtand thoſe Phraſes of *being in Chriſt, ingrafted into Chriſt, united to Chriſt*; I deny that theſe Phraſes ſignifie no more than to be *one who belongs to the Society whereof Chriſt is the head.* The whole Church is *in Chriſt*, and ſhall we ſay that the Church, being *in Chriſt*, is the Churches being *in it ſelf*: A *particular* Church may be ſaid to be *in God the Father*, as well as in *God the Son*; ſo is the *Church of the Theſſalonians* ſaid to be, 1 *Theſſ.* 1. 1. Would it be handſome thus to Paraphraſe the Apoſtles words, *unto the Church of the Theſſalonians which*

which is in God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ; that is, *which is in the Church.* It may be, this Gentleman means that for a *particular believer to be in Christ*, is no more than to be *in the Church*, and that in order of Nature, a man is first united to the *Church*, then to *Christ*; and if this be his meaning, then he must hold that the first believer, whoever he was, was not *in Christ*; until he had a certain number of fellow-believers, enough to make *a Church*, and then all together were united unto *Christ*; and had his first fellow-believers fallen off from *Christ*, then had he again been not united unto *Christ*, and must have waited till there had been other members making a Church, and by joyning himself unto them, then, and not till then had he been again united to *Christ*. If this be that which he aims at, he will not sure expect we should forthwith receive his Doctrine; and he shall do well not to make the receiving of this an Article of Church-Communion, lest he should find it unpossible upon these terms ever to gather a Church; doubtless every one that is sanctified doth first *submit himself to Christ*, and by *submitting unto Christ*, he is in *Christ*, and *Christ in him*; but such is his *submission unto Christ*, that it inclines him to submit himself to the *Ministers of Christ*, and to walk in all ordinances with those that have submitted to the Laws and Government of *Christ*, as well as himself. Indeed the *Church of Christ* can receive no Member till there be presumption that *Christ* hath first received that Member, and that Member received *Christ*: And a mans *union*

to

to Christ, doth in order of Nature precede his *union to the Church*, and would continue, though a man should suppose (which perhaps is impossible) that there should be no Church for him to be united to. And if this Gentleman thinks it unintelligible, How a Believer should be *in Christ, and Christ in a Believer*, he may be pleased to know, that it is unintelligible to none but himself.

Pag. 22. "He hath told us there (*in the* "*Gospel*) whatever he intends to do for us, "and hath charged us to expect no more from "him.

If the meaning be that, *Christ hath in his Gospel told us on what terms we must expect Justification, Adoption, Glorification, and charged us not to expect these on lower or easier terms than are expressed in the Gospel*, I must needs say, your *Author* is not mistaken; but if that be his only meaning, he is not the happiest man in the world in expressing himself; for his words sound as if he were of the mind of the *wildest Fanaticks*, who are of Opinion, *That Christ in his Gospel hath told us all the remarkable particularities of his Providence towards the Church, even till time shall be no more. Christ hath told us in the Gospel whatever he intends to do for us.* What can this import less, than that *Christ hath told us in the Gospel, that at such a time Kingly and Episcopal Government should be restored here in England?*

Pag. 26. "He raised up some great exam-"ples, and Preachers of Righteousness, such "as *Enoch*, and *Noah* and *Abraham*; and gave

"such

" ſuch plain and undenyable proofs of his ac-
" ceptance of theſe men, as might reaſonably
" encourage others to imitate their examples.
" He tranſlated *Enoch* immediately to Heaven,
" and preſerved *Noah* and his Family in the
" Ark, when he deſtroyed the reſt of the World
" by a deluge of Waters, he ſent *Lot* out of
" the ruines of *Sodom*, and made *Abraham* the
" Father of a great Nation; which was a con-
" vincing Argument how dear theſe good men
" were to God, and what others might expect
" from him, who would worſhip and fear him
" as they did.

Something in theſe words is *queſtionable*, ſomething *falſe*. 1. It is *queſtionable*, whether *God immediately tranſlated Enoch to Heaven*; and therefore it would have become this young Divine, not barely to affirm, but ſtrongly to prove *Enoch*'s *Tranſlation to Heaven*; and when he hath proved that, it will be another work to prove that he was *immediately tranſlated to Heaven*. 2. It is *falſe*, that the Favours of God to *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Lot*, *Abraham*, *are convincing Arguments what others may expect from him, who will worſhip and fear him as they did*. Hundreds and thouſands have *worſhipped and feared God as they did*, who never expected from him ſuch extraordinary Favours and Rarities of Grace as thoſe Elders had vouchſafed to them, nor indeed had they any ground to build ſuch an Expection on.

Pag. 27. " When God choſe the Poſterity
" of *Abraham* to be his peculiar People, he did
" not deſign to exclude the reſt of the World
" from

" from his Care and Providence, and all poſ-
" ſible Means of Salvation, as the Apoſtle ar-
" gues in *Rom.* 3. 29. *Is he the God of the Jews*
" *onely? is he not alſo of the Gentiles? yes, of*
" *the Gentiles alſo:* which Argument if it have
" any force in it, muſt prove Gods reſpect to
" the Gentiles before the Preaching of the Go-
" ſpel, as well as ſince, becauſe it is founded
" on that natural Relation God owns to all
" Mankind, as their merciful Creator, and
" Governour; which gives the Gentiles as well
" as the Jewes, an intereſt in his Care and Pro-
" vidence.

True it is, that *Gods chooſing the ſeed of Abraham, did not exclude all the reſt of the World from his Care and Providence, nor make ſalvation impoſſible to the reſt of Mankind.* But when God *choſe Iſrael*, he did for many years *rejeƈt the reſt of the World from his ſpecial care and Providence*, and from all *ordinary* wayes and means of Salvation. If God ſaved any but the *Jews*, it was by bringing them among the *Jews*, or the *Jews* among them; or by acquainting them in ſome extraordinary way with the ſubſtance of that Doctrine concerning the *promiſed ſeed* that was ordinarily preached among the *Jews*.

Pag. 29 " He *(God)* committed his Laws
" and Oracles to them *(the People of Iſrael)*
" from whence the reſt of the world, when they
" pleaſed, might fetch the beſt Rules of Life,
" and the moſt certain notices of the Divine
" Will.

This

This is very ſtrange, and next to impoſſible; the reſt of the world could not *fetch the Laws from the People of Iſrael*, unleſs they knew that there were ſuch a People as the people of *Iſrael*, and that they had the *Oracles of God* among them, and which was the way to travel to this people. And did the one half of the world know this? But let us ſuppoſe that all the world knew of the *Iſraelites*, and of their *Laws*, and how they might come to the *Iſraelites*; ſuppoſe we alſo that the *Jews* would be ſo kind as to let remote Nations have a ſight and Copy of their Lawes, theſe Laws could be no Notices of the Divine Will, till tranſlated into a known tongue. Were there alwayes among the *Jews* men that could tranſlate the Law into all Languages?

Pag. 33. "Whereas God was formerly "known by the Light of Nature, and the works "of Creation and Providence, and thoſe par- "tial and occaſional Revelations of his Will, "which he made to the World; now the onely "true *Medium* of knowing God, is the know- "ledge of Chriſt, who came into the World to "declare God to us.

If this be not down-right *Fanaticiſm*, I know not what is. Heretofore the *Light of Nature*, and the *Works of Creation and Providence* were true *Mediums* for the knowing of God, now they are not only dark and inſufficient (as they ever were ſince the Fall) but alſo falſe *Mediums* of knowing God. *Chriſt* is the only true *Medium*, all others muſt be thrown away, or not made uſe of, unleſs we deſign to be deceived by

by them. Would Mr. *Tho. Brooks* have written thus?

Pag. 42. "The Light of Nature, and the "works of Creation and Providence, *&c.* assures us, that God is so good that he desires "and designs the happiness of all his Creatures according to the capacity of their Natures, *&c.* very patient and long-suffering "towards the worst of men.

Doth not onely the *Revelation made by Christ*, but also the *Light of Nature* assure us, that *God desires and designs the happiness of all his Creatures according to the capacity of their Natures*? How then comes it to pass, that all his creatures are not happy? doth God fail of his *desire*? doth he miscarry in his *design*? or do the creatures lose the *capacity of their Natures*? As for *patience* and *long-sufferance* God exercised none towards the fallen *Angels*, nor do we find that *Adam* and *Eve* after their Fall had any expectation that God would exercise it towards them. Indeed the Histories of *God's* Providence manifest that he hath very long endured some very bad men (which was a great stone of offence to some of the greatest *Philosophers*) with others not so bad, as far as we could judge, he made *short work in righteousness*; so that sinners have little reason to promise themselves that God will spare them, when they wilfully sin against him.

Pag. 44. "It is not possible to under-"stand what Goodness is, without pardoning "Grace.

A very bold and rude Assertion. *God* is good

to all his Creatures, and yet some of them need no *pardoning Grace*, because they never sinned; others of his creatures cannot sin, because they have no notions of *God*, nor of a *Law*, and so they are uncapable of *pardoning Grace*. Perhaps this Author would be understood of *sinfull* creatures, they may be assured that *God* is *very good*, and good he cannot be without pardoning Grace. If so, let *God* look to it; *Maximus* he may be accounted, but *Optimus* he may not look to be called, if he do not find out some way to pardon sin, and make some discovery to all sinners, that he is ready to pardon them, till he hath done this, they *cannot understand that he is good*.

Pag. 45. "That God is so Just and Righte-"ous, that he cannot pardon sin without sa-"tisfaction to his Justice, is such a Notion of "Justice that is perfectly new, which neither "Scripture, nor Nature aquaints us with.

That *God cannot forgive sin without satisfaction*, I did never yet believe, nor shall as I suppose ever be brought to believe. Yet I should account I had made shipwrack of all Modesty, if I should be so hardy as to affirm this Notion, That Gods Justice cannot be diverted from sinners without the interposing of a Propitiation, is *perfectly new*. Many well acquainted with *Nature* and *Scripture*, did in former Ages believe, as also in this present Age many do still believe, it implyes a contradiction, that the rational creature made under a Law with a a sanction, and having broken that Law, should not either be punished in his own person, or in some

ſome one that undertook for him. Yea, there be ſome of greater Learning than I can hope to attain to, who ſay, that *pardon of ſin without ſatisfaction is ſimply impoſſible, though it had never been ſaid to Adam, In the day thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt die the death: Quia implicit ut Deus habeat ſupremum & abſolutum Dominium in hominem, & homo non obligetur ad actualem obedientiam, aut eâ deficiente ad vicariam ejus compenſationem per pœnam.*

And I muſt needs ſay, that the learned are confirmed in theſe Opinions, by the weak Oppoſitions that ſome men make againſt them, and that one can ſcarce imagine a weaker Oppoſition to be made, than what is made by this *Predicant*, *pag.* 48.

"If Juſtice be ſo natural to God, that no-
"thing could ſatisfie him but the Death of his
"Son, the Redemption of the World by Chriſt
"may diſcover his Juſtice or his Goodneſs,
"but not his Wiſdom; for Wiſdom conſiſts in
"the choice of the beſt and fitteſt Means to at-
"tain an End, when there are more wayes of
"doing it.

If there be any *wit* in this Argument, ſurely there is not much *wiſdom* nor *judgement* in it; for *wiſdom* may very well conſiſt in finding out *fit* means that are not very obvious for attaining an End, though there be *no other* means for the attaining of that End. Let Mr. *Sherlock* find out the *Quadrature of a Circle*, and we will count him a *wiſe man*, and never put him to the trouble of demonſtrating that there were other wayes of finding out that *Knack*, only

his way was the *fitteſt* and *beſt*: Yea, let him but find out a ſatisfactory *medium* to prove that the *Faculties* are *really diſtinct*, or are *not really diſtinct* in the Soul, and we will crie him up for a *wiſe man*, and never enquire whether there were not other *mediums* to prove thoſe Concluſions by. But the truth is, this *pert Preacher* underſtands not the Queſtion betwixt himſelf and Dr. *J. O.* as will appear from what he layes down *pag.* 50. "The Deſert "of ſin is ſuch, that it is impoſſible to make "any ſatisfaction to the Juſtice of God, but "onely by the death of Chriſt, otherwiſe "Chriſt had died in vain. This one would think ſhould go down without much chewing, and ſo indeed it would, but that Mr. *S.* could not or would not underſtand the meaning of it, for thus he explains it, "That is, that God "could not forgive it (*ſin*) without full ſa-"tisfaction, which nothing but the Death of "Chriſt could make. I appeal to all men of common ſence and reaſon, whether theſe two Propoſitions be the ſame.

"It is impoſſible to make ſatisfaction to the "Juſtice of God but by the Death of Chriſt; "God cannot forgive ſin without full ſatis-"faction.

Pag. 52. "Vindictive Juſtice and pardoning "Mercy are but ſecondary Attributes of the "Divine Nature.

This ſeems to me a ſpick and ſpan new Propoſition, and I hope it never before this time dropped from any mans pen. Very abſurd I am ſure it is.

Pag.

Pag. 58. "By this it appears how rigo-
"rously just God is, that he will never par-
"don the least sin, when he can serve his own
"Glory by the misery and confusion of sin-
"ners.

By this; by what? if he can frame any Propositions or Premises of Dr. *Owen*, from which so absurd a conclusion can be drawn, then shall I wish that such a creature as Dr. *Owen* had never been born; let him when he next puts out, try his skill in *Logick*.

I am almost weary of raking in a Dunghill, and therefore you must excuse me, if I take no notice of any thing else till I come to *pag.* 107. where thus our Author phrasifyeth, "If we
"would get the Blessing, we must go to God,
"as *Jacob* did, in the Robes of our Elder Bro-
"ther, though I confess this resemblance doth
"not please me very well; for though *Jacob*
"was a good man, yet this looks like a cunning
"trick, to rob his elder Brother of the Bles-
"sing, and to cheat his blind Father; and men
"must not think that God is thus to be impo-
"sed on.

Who they be that have made use of this resemblance, he discovereth not; yet it is like enough some *Non-conforming Divines* may be intended; nor can I deny that some of them have made use of it, sundry of the *ancient Fathers* had so done before they were born. This Author saith, *it pleaseth him not very well*; if it do not, let all the *Non-conforming Ministers* have a care that they mention it no more, for Mr. *Sh.* is one that if he be not *very well pleased*, will

lay about him, and make the whole Nation witneſſes of his diſpleaſure. But, as I ſaid before, the *Fathers* made uſe of this reſemblance before the *Non-conformiſts* medled with it, and is it come to that paſs, that a *poor Predicant* muſt be jeered for ſpeaking as the Fathers did? Time was I am certain, when a *Miniſter* that was called in queſtion for a *Puritanical* Sermon, came off well enough when he made it appear, that the moſt offenſive paſſages were but St. *Chryſoſtom* tranſlated. This notwithſtanding, I am not huge fond of the *Reſemblance*, and ſhall be content it be laid aſide, if Mr. *Sherlock* can but prevail to have another Reſemblance laid aſide, which I think I have as little reaſon to be *well pleaſed* with: A certain *conforming Miniſter* was wont alway to have this in his form of Prayer before Sermon, *Grant that with the good Thief on the Croſs we may ſteal Heaven when we die.* By a little enquiry he may find out the man, and if he can prevail with him to omit it, I will uſe my intereſt with any Non-conformiſt I am acquainted with, no more to uſe the *Reſemblance of Jacobs putting on the Garments of his elder Brother, and in them getting the Bleſſing.* Yet I aſſure him, I heard it very largely inſiſted on, in a Sermon made by one of the preſent *Prebends* of *Canterbury*.

Pag. 119. Mr. *Sh.* falls upon thoſe who ſay that "Faith juſtifieth as it brings us to Chriſt, "and makes us one with him by whom we are "juſtified; Faith apprehends the the Righte-"ouſneſs of Chriſt, and the Righteouſneſs of "Chriſt

"Christ justifieth. *Well what hath he against this Distinction? he saith,* "It plainly oweth it "self to their preconceived Opinions, without "which no man could ever have stumbled on't. "That when the Scripture saith, that Faith "justifieth, the meaning should be, that it justi- "fies and saves instrumentally and relatively, "(*words which the Scriptures are unacquainted* "*with*) i. e. not as it is Faith, but as it appre- "hends the Righteousness of Christ, which in "plain words signifieth, that Faith doth not "justifie, though the Scripture so often sayes "it does.

If this Gentleman think Mr. *Baxter* hath not sufficiently beaten those who thus misrepresent *Faith's concurrence to Justification*, good leave he hath from me to take his Cudgel and to bang them: But let him not lay about him without fear or wit, as here he seems to do. They will but laugh at him, if he tell them, *That the Scripture often sayes, that Faith justifies*; for they have been told, That *Scripture no where saith Faith justifieth*, though it often speak of *being justified by Faith*. Hath this Divine so much forgot his *Grammar*, as to know no distinction betwixt *justifieth* and *being justified?* And can he imagine that the world will believe his Adversaries to be so simple, as to say, that the meaning of *Faith's justifying* is, that it *justifieth* and *saveth too?* But I were best beware how I meddle with this *great Author*, who speaks of himself as if he had read all that ever did write, and had heard all that ever did speak.

Pag. 121. He blames Mr. *Watſon*, for ſaying, *All that Faith doth is to bring home Chriſts merits to the ſoul*, adding, "If you can "but find out an improper and abſurd form of "ſpeech in uſe among the Vulgar, or if you "can but invent one, as this Gentleman doth, "for I never met with this before, it is a ſuf- "ficient reaſon to expound Scripture as im- "properly as unlearned men talk or think.

If his *for* have any *reaſon* in it, and certainly he intended it ſhould have ſome, then it is thus to be formed, *That which Mr.* Watſon *uſeth, and I never met with before, that Mr.* Watſon *invented: This phraſe Mr.* Watſon *uſeth, and I never met with it before, therefore he invented it.* Juſt at the ſame rate he muſt be conceived to argue, *pag.* 128. *That which I never read of before, is a very new conceit: I never read before of Faith's ſucking Juſtification out of the ſpiritual Stomack; therefore it is a very new conceit.* This is juſt according to the old Obſervation, that *Young men are confident.*

Sir, I am not now Apologizing for Mr. *Watſon*, he is of Age, and can ſpeak for himſelf, if he count it needfull; nor have I Mr. *Watſons* Books by me; if I had, perhaps I might find that he is abuſed, for I do aſſure you, Mr *Sh.* doth not much ſtick at abuſing and wronging thoſe whom he deals with: ſo that when an *ordinary Reader* would ſuppoſe he beats his Adverſaries, a *Scholar* may ſoon find he only threſheth a man of Clouts of his own making.

Pag. 132. He takes Dr. *O.* as I suppose to task for saying, "That though Holiness be neither the cause, matter, nor condition of Justification; yet it is the way appointed by God for us to walk in, for the obtaining Salvation. Now what hath he against this? he confesseth it is, "home to the purpose, but yet there are "two little faults in it, that it contradicts it "self, and overthrows their darling opinion; "which I can very well pardon, if he can. Really he is a good natured man that can so very well pardon a contradiction, he had contradicted himself, as I noted before, and needing pardon from others, will give pardon to others; but I pray you what contradiction is there in the Dr's words? why this is a contradiction, that Holiness should be affirmed to be the *necessary way to eternal life*; and yet neither the *cause*, *matter*, nor *condition*: this looks I confess like a contradiction, but now the Dr. did not say, *That Holiness was neither the cause, matter, nor condition of eternal life or salvation, but neither the cause, matter, nor condition of Justification*; let us set Dr. *Owen*'s two Propositions together: *Holiness is neither the cause, matter, nor condition of our Justification. Holiness is the way appointed by God for us to walk in, for the obtaining of Salvation.* What *contradiction* is there in these two *Propositions*? just as much as there is betwixt two *Propositions* that consist not of the same *predicate*; that is, none at all. Mr. *Sh.* may do well to study his *Logick* again, and find out there what a *contradiction* is, before he charge any other

ther *Dr. of Divinity* with a *Contradiction.*

Pag. 137. Mr. *Sh.* falls into a fit of Admiration, *at the Wisdom and honesty of our Church of* England, *who in her publick Catechism* (he takes no notice of her Articles or her Homilies) *hath been careful to prevent cheats and delusions of fancy, feeds her Children with wholesom and substantial food, hath taught them a Religion without art or subtlety, hath instructed them in the Nature of their Baptismal vow, and those Obligations it layes on them to a vertuous life: hath taught them the Apostles Creed, which contains those great and essential Articles of Religion, which are the necessary principles of Action,* (i. e. hath taught them to say them, but hath not explained the one half of them) *hath given them a plain and easie explication of the Ten Commandments, which are the rules of good life, hath taught them to pray to God,* (by propounding to be learn'd the Lord's prayer with out the Doxology) *and what the true design of our Saviours Institutions is, without filling their heads with Notions and Artificial Theories of Religion, which serve only to make them giddy with a vain conceit of knowledge, to talk ill and to live worse.*

I have already noted by the by, that the Gentleman takes no notice of the *Churches* either *Articles* or *Homilies*, had he touched them he would have found himself to have a *wolf by the Ears.* For though perhaps he laughs at the *Articles* and *Homilies* in his sleeve, yet he hath more either of wisdom or honesty, than

than openly to gibe at them, to which he hath ſubſcribed; and yet if he had recited their words, the world would ſoon have ſeen that the weapons formed againſt Dr. *O.* Mr. *W.* might have been uſed as ſucceſsfully againſt the contrivers of our *Articles* and *Homilies*, and the Authors of other writings allowed by *Royal Authority*. In King *Edward*'s dayes, Biſhop *Poinet*'s *Catechiſm* was appointed to be taught in Schools, Mr. *Nowel*'s *Catechiſm* was authorized in Queen *Elizabeth*'s dayes, and I think ſtill continueth to be the *authorized Catechiſm*; in thoſe *Catechiſms* I find faith called *the hand, and the mouth*, and yet this *man of Drollery* thinks, that if *faith were not a very humble grace, ſhe would never take ſuch language*. But I will not hope to repreſs the *petulance* of his wit, by the *Authority* of theſe *Catechiſms*, he will ſay they are deſigned for *School-boyes*, and not for *Divines*, the *Homilies* ſhould be read by him on *Holy-dayes*, unleſs he have then a *Sermon*, and he hath acknowledged them to *contain a good and wholſome Doctrine*, let us try whether they do not lye as open to this Gentleman's *Witticiſms*, as the *Sermons* or *Diſcourſes* of *J. O.* and *T. W.* The Sermons in the firſt *Tome of Homilies* that treat of *Juſtification*, are entituled *of Salvation*. Thus begins the firſt; "Becauſe all men be ſinners, *&c.* therefore "can no man by his own acts, works, deeds, "(ſeem they never ſo good) be juſtified and "made righteous before God; but every man "is conſtrained of neceſſity to ſeek for another "righteouſneſs or juſtification to be received at

God's

"God's own hands, *i. e.* the forgiveneſs of "ſins. And this juſtification or righteouſneſs, "which we ſo receive of God's mercies, and "Chriſt's merits, embraced by faith, is taken, "accepted, allowed of God for our perfect and "full juſtification.

I was about to tranſcribe much of the *Homilies*, but ſeeing they are in many mens hands, and ſhould be in all Churches, that will be needleſs, therefore I ſhall only excerpe ſome Propoſitions out of them, and quote the pages according to the Edition by *John Bill*, 1623.

"All the world being wrapped in ſin, God "ſent his only Son our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt "into this world to fulfil the Law for us, *&c.* "*p.* 13.

"God provided a Ranſome for us, the moſt "precious blood of his own moſt dear, and "beſt beloved Son Jeſus Chriſt, who beſides "this Ranſome, fulfilled the Law for us per-"fectly, *pag.* 14.

"St. *Paul* declareth nothing upon the behalf "of man concerning his Juſtification, but only "a true and lively Faith, which nevertheleſs is "the gift of God, and not man's only work "without God, and yet that faith doth not ſhut "out Repentance, Hope, Love, Dread, and "the fear of God, to be joyned with faith in "every man that is Juſtified; but it ſhutteth "them out from the Office or Juſtifying. So "that although they be all preſent together in "him that is juſtified, yet they juſtifie not alto-"gether, Nor the faith alſo doth not ſhut out

"the

" the Juſtice of our good works neceſſary to be
" done afterwards of duty towards God, but it
" excludeth them, ſo that we may not do them
" to this intent to be made good by doing of
" them, *pag.* 14, 15.

" Chriſt is now the Righteouſneſs of all them
" that truly do believe in him; he for them
" paid their Ranſome by his Death: He for
" them fulfilled the Law in his life, *ibid.*

" Juſtification is not the office of Man, but
" of God; or Man cannot make himſelf righ-
" teous by his own works, neither in part, nor
" in the whole, for that were the greateſt arro-
" gancy and preſumption of man, that Anti-
" chriſt could ſet up againſt God, to affirm that
" a man may by his own works take away and
" purge his own Sins, & ſo juſtifie himſelf, *p.* 17.

" The true underſtanding of this Doctrine,
" *we be juſtified freely by faith without works*;
" is not, that this our own act, to believe in
" Chriſt, or this our faith in Chriſt which is
" within us, doth juſtifie, and deſerve our Juſti-
" fication unto us (for that were to count our
" ſelves to be juſtified by ſome act or vertue
" that is within our ſelves) but, *&c.* Ibid.

" Faith in Chriſt (as it were) ſaith unto us
" thus, it is not I that take away your ſins, but
" it is Chriſt only, and to him only I ſend you
" for that purpoſe, forſaking therein all your
" good vertues, words, thoughts, and works,
" and only putting your truſt in Chriſt, *p.* 18.

" Becauſe faith doth directly ſend us to Chriſt
" for remiſſion of our ſins, and that by faith gi-
" ven us of God, we embrace the promiſe of

" God's

"God's mercy, and of the remission of our "sins (which thing none other of our vertues "or works properly doth) therefore Scripture "useth to say, that faith without works doth "justifie, *ibid.*

"All the Fathers, Martyrs, and other Holy "men (whom St. *Paul* spake of *Heb.* 11.) had "their faith surely fixed in God when all the "world was against them. They did not only "know God to be the Lord, Maker and Go-"vernour of all men in the world, but also "they had a special confidence and trust, that "he was, and would be their God, their com-"forter, aider, helper, maintainer, and de-"fender. This is the Christian faith which "these Holy men had, and we also ought to "have. And although they were not named "Christian-men, yet it was a Christian-faith "that they had, for they looked for all benefits "of God the Father, through the merits of his "Son Jesus Christ, as we now do. This diffe-"rence is between them and us, that they "looked when Christ should come, and we be "in the time when he is come. Therefore saith "St. *Aug.* the time is altered and changed, "but not the faith; for we have both one "faith in one Christ. The same Holy Ghost "also which we have, had they. God gave "them then Grace to be his Children, as he doth "us now, *&c.* In effect they and we be all one, "we have the same faith they had in God, and "they the same we have, *pag.* 25.

"Faith giveth life to the Soul, and they be as "much dead to God that lack faith, as they be

"to

"to the world, whose bodies lack souls; with-
"out faith all that is done of us, is but dead
"before God, although the work seem never
"so gay and glorious before man. Even as the
"picture graven or painted, is but a dead re-
"presentation of the thing it self, and is with-
"out life, or any manner of moving; so be the
"works of all unfaithful persons before God.
"They do appear to be lively works, and in-
"deed they be but dead, not availing to the
"everlasting life. They be but shadows & shews
"of lively and good things, and not good and
"lively things indeed. For true faith doth give
"life to the works, and out of such faith come
"good works, that be very good works indeed,
"& without faith, no work is good before God,
"as saith St. *Aug. pag.* 30. And there, and in
"*pag.* 31, 32. much is quoted to the same
"purpose out of St. *Augustine*, St. *Ambrose*,
"St. *Chrysostom.* Among other things, this is
"quoted with approbation from *Chrysostome*,
"I can shew a man that by faith without works,
"lived and came to Heaven; but without
"faith never man had life. The Thief that
"was hanged, when Christ suffered, did believe
"only, and the most mereiful God justified
"him. And because no man shall say again
"that he lacked time to do good works, else
"he would have done them: Truth it is, and
"I will not contend therein, but this I will
"surely affirm, that faith only saved him. If
"he had lived, and not regarded faith, and the
"works thereof, he should have lost his salva-
"tion again. But this is the effect that I say,

"that

" that faith by it self saved him, but works by
" themselves never justified any man.

These are some of many things which I could have quoted out of the *Homilies*, which Mr. *Sh.* is bound to read to his people, and which were published by Queen *Elizabeth*, *to expel erroneous and poysonous Doctrine*, and were reprinted by King *James*, not only for *a help of Non-Preaching*, but withall, as a *pattern for Preaching Ministers*. How ill Mr. *Sh.* hath fitted his cloath to this pattern, he that is not very blind may see; somebody perhaps may be at so much trouble, as to gather up his *drolling Parentheses*, and adapt them to the expressions in the *Homilies*, composed perhaps, as to the first Tome of them by Arch. *Cranmer*, and as to the last of them by a *Prelate* not inferior to him for learning and piety. I have no mind to make the *Papists* and other *Sectaries* so much sport. But certainly had I a Cure of Souls, I would every *Holy-day* when there was no Sermon in my *Church*, either read or cause to be read one of them to my People, and should not dare to expose the Doctrines contained in them, as Mr. *Sh.* manifestly doth: I might look before I leapt, well consider whether it were meet to *tye up my self not to contradict some passages in the* Homilies; but when I had so *tyed my self*, I would either strictly observe my Obligation, or openly declare my sorrow for bringing my self under it.

But because he hath so much applauded the *Milk for Babes*, or *the Liturgical Catechism*, let

let us take ſome notice of that which for my part I ſo much approve, that I would not for all the Money in my Pocket a new *Catechiſm* were now to be made. In that *Catechiſm* we ſhall find ſomething of *Art and Subtlety* as this Gentleman would call it. The Child in that *Catechiſm*, is firſt asked, *What is his Name?* that Queſtion may be anſwered without *Art* or *Subtlety*; but then in the next place, being asked, *who gave him that Name?* he is directed to make anſwer, *My Godfathers, and my Godmothers in my Baptiſm, when I was made a Member of Chriſt, a Child of God*, &c. If the Child was at *Baptiſm made a Member of Chriſt*, he was alſo then *united to Chriſt*, and put *into Chriſt*; for nothing can be a *member of that* unto which it is *not united*.

Now ſuppoſe any Child ſhould be ſo pert or malepert, as to ask the *Rector* what the word *Chriſt* ſignifieth, when it is ſaid that he was made a *Member of Chriſt*; the *Rector* will gravely anſwer, *Chriſt hath four ſignifications; It ſignifies the Office of Chriſt, the Perſon of Chriſt, the Doctrine of Chriſt, the Church of Chriſt.* The Child was not I ſuppoſe made a *Member of Chriſt's Office*, nor of *Chriſt's Doctrine*; he muſt be made a *Member* therefore, *either of the Perſon of Chriſt*, or of the *Church of Chriſt*. It is like Mr. *Sh.* will anſwer the Child that he was *made a Member of the Church of Chriſt*. But what this *Church of Chriſt* is, the Child no where finds explained in the *Church Catechiſm*. The *Holy Catholick Church* is mentioned as one of the things to be believed

in the *Creed*, and I think the word also occurs in the first question concerning the *Sacraments*, (which part of the Catechism is no older than the *Hampton*-Court Conference) but what the word *Church* signifieth is no where opened in that *Catechism*; will Mr. *Sh.* now say that the Child is to profess himself a Member of he knows not what? I suppose he will not, but rather will tell him what the *Church* is, and then he must use some *Art* or *Subtlety* to make him understand how he is Member of that *Church*; and I think he must be very subtle that can make a Child understand how he can be a *Member of the Church of Christ*, before he have first made him understand how he was made a *Member of Christ himself*. And I doubt the Child's head must be filled with notions before he can be made understand how he is one of those *elect people of God, whom the Spirit sanctifieth.*

You will hope that in the next place I will take Mr. *Sh.* to task for his Exposition of *John* 15. *v.* 1. *&c.* beginning *p.* 145. but it is so Singular, so uncouth, so forced, that it cannot deserve consideration. Our Saviour saith, *I am the true Vine, and my Father is the Husbandman*; some Copies add, *and ye are the Branches.* The meaning, saith this grand Interpreter is, *That Church which is founded on the belief of my Gospel is the true Vine,* ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινὴ. But lest it should seem strange, that Christ using the first person singular, should mean the Church, he presently adds, *I, signifies Christ, together with his Church.* Did ever man write at this rate?

rate? in one humour he ſaith, *I am*, meaneth *the Church is*; within two lines he is in another humour, and then the meaning is, *I am*, i. e. *I and the Church are*. Take him in which humour you will, neither is very good. *Church* founded on the belief of the Goſpel, there was none when *Chriſt* uſed theſe words; the *Jewiſh Church, State, and Ordinances* then ſtood, and were to ſtand till *Chriſt* dyed. *Chriſt* himſelf ſpeaks indeed once of his *Church*, but he ſpeaketh of it, not as exiſting, but as that which was to exiſt, not as built, but as to be built: The firſt time we read of any Goſpel Church as exiſting, is in the *Acts*. So then if Mr. *Sh*'s. fancy hold, at this rate our *Bleſſed Saviour* muſt be ſuppoſed to ſpeak, "I, and the Goſpel "Church which ſhall ſhortly be planted, and "the planting whereof I muſt commit to you, "are the true Vine, and my Father is the Hus- "bandman, and you your ſelves are the bran- "ches of this Vine; that is, of me, and of "that Church which is made up of you, or "muſt be added to you. There's certainly more of *Art* and *Subtlety* than uſually hath been obſerved in any ſpeech of our Saviour that he uſed ſo near his death. But this Gentleman hath four Reaſons to confirm his interpretation, but which of his interpretations I cannot yet tell; only I ſuppoſe he means the laſt. *I, that is, I and my Church*, but let him be thought alſo if you pleaſe, to mean thus, *I, that is, the Church founded on the belief of my Goſpel.*

His first reason is, because the "*Jewish* Church "is frequently in the Old Testament compared "to a Vine; now a Vine being the Metaphor "whereby the Church useth to be described, we "cannot reasonably understand it otherwise "here.

He should have produced some place of the *Old Testament*, wherein *God* speaking in the first Person, called *himself and the Jewish Church the Vine*: This he doth not, and yet thinks his exposition cannot reasonably be refused; but I suppose he will meet with but few that will account themselves every a whit the more unreasonable, for refusing this exposition confirmed by no better an argument.

Secondly, *God* (saith he) *is called the Husbandman who takes care to dress this Vine, which cannot be understood of Christ, but of the Church.* But by his leave, *God* is not here said to be Husbandman *taking care of the Vine*, but only the Husbandman *pruning, or purging the fruitful branches, and taking away the fruitless branches.* Now the branches are Christ's Disciples.

Thirdly, *Christ*, saith he, *speaks of such branches in him as bear no fruit.* This is boldly said, and cannot be proved if any one will deny it, the words may be read, *not every branch in me that beareth not fruit*, but *every branch that beareth not fruit in me*; so the Old *English Translation* read: so the *Syriack* seems to have read, so *Abbot* against *Bishop* thinks it should be read. But let us not put the Gentleman too hard to it, let us grant that reading which alone

alone can ſerve his turn; what follows? why this, *there can be no branches in the Perſon of Chriſt, not bearing fruit*, Ergo, by *being in him can ſignifie no more than being Members of his viſible Church.* How long ſhall we be wearied with ſuch trifles? there may be *branches in Chriſt* who do not bear fruit, and all *branches* are ſuch, who be not *in Chriſt* by faith unfeigned, and love undiſſembled.

In the fourth place he thinks to ſtrike all dead, and to prevent all objections from the Chapter it ſelf, *whence it is evident that when Chriſt ſpeaks in the firſt Perſon, I and mine, he cannot mean this of his own Perſon, but of his Church, Doctrine, and Religion, according as the circumſtances of the place require.* Thus *ver.* 5. *I am the true Vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me, and I in him, the ſame bringeth forth much fruit, for without me ye can do nothing. He would willingly learn what ſenſe can be made of this, if we underſtand it of the Perſon of Chriſt.* If he would willingly learn this, verily he may have many Maſters that will teach him. St. *John's* Goſpel is commented upon by many, both *Ancient* and *Modern* Writers, all expound the words clearly enough without the help of his new crotchet; but if this *Grave Rector* cannot underſtand, *how we ſhould be in Chriſt, by faith and love, and Chriſt in us by his Spirit and Grace, without penetration of dimenſions, nor how our union to Chriſt ſhould be the ground of fruitfulneſs*; I ſuppoſe his head may be ſomewht dulled, or made heavy, and if ſo, there be *Phyſicians* enow at *London* that can

help him. And for his encouragement you may tell him, that when Mr. *W. D.* was troubled with an humour of making singular expositions of Scripture, Dr. *Sim* of *Huntingdon* gave him some Physick, and the Physick having wrought, the Gentleman was as *Orthodox*, and expounded Scripture as soberly as ever he did in all his life.

But why do I advise this Gentleman to take Physick, his head is already marvellous clear, for he saith *p.* 197. *That nothing is more easie to be understood than our Union and Communion with Christ.* He is an happy man indeed if he can understand our *Union and Communion with Christ, as easily as any other thing whatever.* I suppose our *Union with Christ*, is that which the *Apostle* calls a *great mysterie*, and am apt to think that *great mysteries* are not *as easie to be understood as any other things whatever.* Certain I am, that our *Union with Christ* is an *Union*, and if it be so, it cannot be very easie to be understood; let Mr. *Sh.* review his *Metaphysicks*, and he shall find it as hard to attain to a clear and unexceptionable notion of *Union*, as of any term, commonly called *Transcendental.* Shall I give another taste what an admirable man Mr. *Sb.* seems to himself? *King* James *his Translators*, we alway took to be Learned men, never did I hear modest man differ from them, *nisi præfatâ venia*; but this man of Criticismes can find them rendring a place *quite contrary to its sence.* What place is it? verily *Col.* 2. 3. Our *English* Translation runs thus, *In whom, or wherein, are hid all the treasures*

of

of Wiſdome and Knowledge. He ſaith this is contrary to the ſence of the place, for it ſhould be, *In whom are all hidden treaſures of Wiſdome and Knowledge.* Many had before him ſuggeſted that the words are rather to be rendred this way; but he is I hope the firſt Beneficed *Engliſh* Proteſtant that ſaid our *Engliſh Tranſlation* is contrary to the ſence of the place. It is one thing not to *hit* the ſence of a place, another thing to give a tranſlation *contrary* to the ſence of a place. I would faign know what *contrariety* here is in our Tranſlation to the ſence of the place; for I doubt Mr. *Sh.* doth not well underſtrnd what *contrariety* is. His Propoſition, and the Propoſition of our *Tranſlators* may be both true, ſo cannot two contrary Propoſitions. Beſides, if a man ſhould be ſo rigid as to demand of him an argument why our Tranſlation is not to be followed, I doubt he would be at a loſs. Sure I am, the *Engliſh* Tranſlation is not ſingular. But here I muſt acquaint Mr. *Sherlock's* hearers with a myſterie: He will read *Col.* 2. as he is appointed by the Kalendar, and will at the 3 *v.* read in whom are hid all the Treaſures of Wiſdom and Knowledge, but they muſt remember that he readeth quite contrary to the ſenſe of the place. And they may do well to get from him a Catalogue of all other places of Scripture that muſt be underſtood in a ſence contrary to what the words he reads imports. Elſe he and they muſt neceſſarily be of contrary minds. And perhaps if they would not differ from him, they muſt get them not only a new Tranſlation, but a new Bible.

But I am gone too far, and must come back to *pag.* 166. where he shews himself a *Latitudinarian*, for these are his words; *When nothing is made the condition of our communion which is expressely forbid by the Laws of our Supreme Lord, we acknowledge his Authority in our subjection to our spiritual Guides, and we disown his Authority in disowning and affronting theirs.* This should have been proved, and not dictated; for I am apt to think that if any thing be made an *Article of Communion* which is forbidden by a *clear and immediate consequence*, I am under no obligation to maintain any *communion*. So am I also if the omission of any duty which *Christ* hath enjoyned be made an Article of my communion. I will never have *Communion* with that *Church* which will allow me *no communion* with her, unless I promise not to baptize my Son till he come to years of discretion, yet I do not believe that Christ hath any where *expressely enjoyned Infant Baptism.* Mr. *Sh.* it seems hath more liberty, I envy it not unto him, but rather wonder, how he came by it.

Pag. 201. He blames some men for having *found out a person for Christ, distinct from his God-head and Manhood.* But I should think they had rather been to blame, if they had found out a *person not distinct from the God-head and Manhood. Godhead* and *Manhood* betoken the two Natures of Christ, and if the *Natures* and *Person* be not distinct, we must amend our *Creeds*, and expunge divers persons out of the black Role of *Heretick*s. Let Mr. *Sh.* try whether he can find out a person for Christ, not

not distinct from his Godhead and Manhood.

I might now fall upon that noble and much agitated controversie concerning the *Imputation of Christ's Righteousness*, of which Mr. *Sh.* saith a great deal, but he manageth it only against one *Dr.* whose words and meaning he also seems to me horribly to pervert and wrest, and that person is about, as I hear, to vindicate himself; so that I cannot count my self at all concerned to meddle in that affair, as to the merits of the cause.

But there is one thing that this *Author* suggests about the controversie, which I cannot but take notice of, *pag.* 239, &c. he saith, "It is "very observable that our Saviour in none of "his Sermons & Parables, as they are recorded, "makes any mention of the imputation of his "Righteousness, but exacts from men a Righte-"ousness of their own, never warns them to "beware of trusting to their own Righte-"ousness, or of expecting Salvation from their "own works; but instead of this, severely "enjoyns them the practice of an universal "Righteousness, as the only thing that pleaseth "God.

I easily grant (and hope none will deny) that *our blessed Lord doth enjoyn the practice of an universal Righteousness:* And an *universal Righteousness* (I do not say a *perfect* Righteousness) *is necessary to our first Justification.* That Adult person who hath not an heart purposed and resolved to give to God and Men (as far as he is able) their due, is for that present unjustifiable, unpardonable, the continuance of an

upright

upright heart, and the expreſſing of it as opportunity ſerves, is neceſſary to the not loſing of Juſtification, and to eternal life. But if Mr. *Sh.* can ſhew me any one place in which our Saviour inſtead of warning his hearers to beware of *truſting to their own Righteouſneſſes*, or of *expecting Salvation by their own works*, ſeverely enjoyns them the *practice of an Univerſal Righteouſneſs, as the only thing that pleaſes God*; I will not only burn all my *Syſtems*, but alſo confeſs that I have read the *four Goſpels* very negligently and careleſſely. Doth this *Gentleman* in good earneſt think, that nothing pleaſeth *God* but our *own univerſal Righteouſneſs?* yea, doth he not think and believe that our *own perſonal Righteouſneſs* all our life long is ſo *ſinfully imperfect*, that God would not be ſo far well pleaſed with it, as to reward it with eternal life, were there not ſomething elſe in the which he is well pleaſed?

Ob. *Doth Chriſt any where in all his Sermons make mention of the Imputation of his Righteouſneſs?*

An. In ſo many terms he doth not, but when he *bleſſeth* thoſe *who hunger and thirſt after righteouſneſs*, Dr. *Hamond* thinks that *hungring* may refer to *inherent righteouſneſs*, & ſignifie *an eager deſire of Grace, of Sanctity of Soul*; & that *thirſting* is apportioned to *imputed righteouſneſs*, which he deſcribed to be *Chriſt's righteouſneſs accepted as ours*; or in plainer terms, the *pardon of our ſins, and acceptation of our perſons in Chriſt?* It may be the *learned Dr.* is a little too Critical in this deſcant on our Saviours Metaphors, but

he

he took it for granted that our Saviour taught his Diſciples of a *twofold righteouſneſs*, elſe he had extreamly forgot himſelf in making ſuch a *Paraphraſe*. *Imputation of Chriſt's righteouſneſs*, in the ſence in which ſome of our *Biſhops*, and *Epiſcopal Divines* pleaded for it, is not founded either on the *Goſpels* or *Epiſtles*: but take it in the ſence in which thoſe *old Nonconformiſts*, Mr. *Anthony Wotton*, and Mr. *W. Bradſhaw*, explained it, and I will undertake againſt Mr. *Sb.* and all others, to prove it out of the *Sermons and Parables of our Saviour*.

Pag. 240. by way of Parentheſis he lets us know, "That he is apt in the firſt place to admire our Saviours Sermons, who was the firſt "Author of our Religion, before the Writings "of the Apoſtles themſelves, though inſpired "men.

If he be but *apt*, and *apt in the firſt place*, I need not much concern my ſelf to enquire what brought him to this *Aptneſs*; I think *Chriſt* is the *onely Author* of our *Religion*, and therefore leave it to him to conſider, why he called him the *firſt Author* of it; but our *Saviour* did no more write the *four Goſpels*, than he did the *Epiſtles*. The *ſame Spirit* that inſpired *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, *John*, to write the *Goſpels*, inſpired *Paul*, *Peter*, *James*, *John*, *Jude*, to write the *Epiſtles*: Wherefore, though I know that *Chriſt* our *Lord* is to be admired above his Servants, yet do not I know why I ſhould read the *Goſpels* with more Admiration or Reverence than the *Epiſtles*. I know no point of *Doctrine* or *Practice* contained in the *Goſpels*, which

which is not also contained in the *Sermons* or *Epistles* of the *Apostles*; some very weighty and momentous truths which I do not find our *Saviour* to have taught his *Disciples* in his *Sermons*, at least not very clearly, I find clearly laid down by the *Apostles* in their *Sermons* related in the *Acts*, or in their *Epistles*.

Pag. 242. "We cannot imagine that our "Saviour would neglect to acquaint his Disci- "ples with the necessary terms and conditions "of Salvation, for his Sermons were to be the "Rule of theirs.

Doubtless, *our Saviour would not neglect any thing*, for then he had not been Faithfull; and there is no question but he *acquainted his Disciples with the necessary terms and conditions of Salvation*, those they were not before acquainted with, and those that were necessary for that time in which he conversed with them: But that nothing now is necessary to be believed by us, which cannot be proved out of the *Gospels*, I am not he that will affirm, nor yet will I say the contrary. Mr. *Sh.* reads to the people that which is commonly called the *Creed of Athanasius*, and that professeth to contain the *Catholick Faith, which if a man do not believe the whole, and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly*; let him consider, whether he can prove all the *Articles* of that *Creed* out of the *Gospels*, not calling in the *Epistles*.

Pag. 243, 244. "It is worth observing, that "in all the New Testament there is no such Ex- "pression as the Righteousness of Christ, or "the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, "which

"which is very ſtrange, did the whole Myſte-
"ry of the Goſpel conſiſt in the Imputation of
"Chriſts Righteouſneſs, that neither Chriſt nor
"his Apoſtles ſhould once tell us ſo in expreſs
"terms.

It would be very ſtrange indeed, if there ſhould be any men who ſay, *The whole Myſtery of the Goſpel lies in the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs*; and if there be none ſuch, it is almoſt as ſtrange, that Mr. *Sh.* ſhould encounter his own ſhadow; but the *Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs* may be a very important and neceſſary Doctrine, notwithſtanding the *expreſs words of Imputing Chriſts Righteouſneſs* occurre not either in *Goſpels* or *Epiſtles*. This Gentleman I hope owneth the *Satisfaction of Chriſt*, and thinks our Hope is built upon it, now if the *Socinians* ſhould object, (and ſo ſimple be they, that ſometimes they do ſo object) *If our hope be ſo built on the Satisfaction of Chriſt, it is ſtrange that neither Chriſt nor his Diſciples ſhould tell us ſo in expreſs terms*; he would not be long a conſidering what anſwer to return them, and what anſwer he would return to them, may ſuffice to remove his own admiration: In the mean time, let him conſult his *Concordance*, and ſee whether there be no ſuch expreſſion as the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt. There is an Expreſſion very near a kin to it, *Rom.* 5. 17, 18. *the Righteouſneſs of one*, is *the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, mentioned *v.* 17.

Pag. 247. "No man could believe in Chriſt
"till he came, *i. e.* could not believe any thing
"upon his Authority.

By

By *coming*, I suppose he means *coming in the flesh*, or *being made man*; and let *Christians* Ears judge, whether such a Proposition as this, *No man could believe any thing on the Authority of Christ till he was incarnate*, be not an *ill-sounding* Proposition, whether it should have been put in Print without some Explication, and some proof. So dull am I, that I can no more see an impossibility in believing a thing on the Authority of *Christ before he came*, than in believing on his Authority *now he is gone* as to his bodily presence.

Pag. 248. "That general obscure Promise, "*In thy seed shall all the Nations of the Earth* "*be blessed*, is all that ever was revealed to "*Abraham* concerning Christ.

What dare not a confident man say? How knows he that this is *all that ever was revealed to Abraham concerning Christ*? He had the benefit of all the *Revelations concerning Christ* that had been made to others, as is probable; also he was met by *Melchisedeck King of Salem Priest of the most High God*, one of the most eminent Types of Christ; God made a *covenant* with him, sealed it with *Circumcision*, the initiating Sacrament of the *Old Testament*; he is called the *Father of the Faithfull*; and yet behold a Divine that dare confidently averre he never had any knowledge of Christ, but by *that general obscure Promise*, *In thy seed shall all the Nations be blessed.*

Pag. 249. "That Christ was to die for the "sins of the World, was more than the Apostles "of Christ themselves understood till after his "Re-

"Reſurrection, though Chriſt had expreſſely "told them of it.

The *Apoſtles* it ſeems, though they had been *ſent to preach*, and had been *told by Chriſt* in expreſs words, that *he muſt die for the ſins of the World*, yet till after the Reſurrection underſtood it not. That they *did not* believe this, or were *unwilling* to believe this, or had forgot it when they ſhould have called it to remembrance to fortifie their hearts, would not ſeem ſo ſtrange; but that they were ſo dull as not to underſtand what was expreſſely told them, ſeems very ſtrange. I pray you therefore get Mr. *Sh.* to prove theſe two things to you. 1. That *Chriſt expreſſely told his Diſciples, that he was to die for the ſins of the World.* 2. *That they underſtood not this till after the Reſurrection.*

Pag. 252. Mr. *Sh.* tells us of a ſtrange Entity, "A natural Faith, founded on natural De- "monſtrations or Moral Arguments; and by this he would have us think that *Abel offered a more acceptable Sacrifice, and Enoch alſo walked with God.*

Never till this very day, did I ever read or hear of a *Faith* built on *natural Demonſtrations*, or *moral Arguments*. Whatever *aſſent* is built on *natural demonſtrations* is *Science*, whatever is built on *moral Arguments*, may be but *Opinion*: *Faith* I have been taught muſt be founded on *Teſtimony*, and *divine Faith* muſt be founded on *divine Teſtimony*; that is, on his *Teſtimony* who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Mr. *Sh.* defines or deſcribes it to be ſuch *a firm and ſtedfaſt perſwaſion of the truth*

of

of those things which are not evident to sense, as makes us confidently expect them. It is not *evident to sense*, that the next Month there shall be a great *Eclipse* of the *Moon*, yet I have a *firm and steadfast perswasion of it*, and do *confidently expect it*; is this *Faith*, or doth it make me a *Believer?* I humbly conceive it doth not, and should count my self much engaged to any one who would prove to me, that any one of those *Worthies* mentioned in *Heb.* 11. did obtain Salvation upon any *Faith* but a *Faith* that was built on some *Divine Promise or Revelation concerning Christ to come.*

Pag. 260. Mr. *Sh.* tells us, "He will examine those Texts of Scripture which are "abused by these men to set up the Personal "Righteousness of Christ as the only formal "cause of our Justification.

Who he means by *these men* I cannot tell. Do or did *those men* whom he scoffingly calls the *great Acquaintances of Christ*, ever bring the *Scriptures* after by him quoted, to prove *Christs Rigteousness to be the only formal cause of our Justification*; if they do not, or did not, then may we conceive that Mr. *Sh.* was some night scared with a Dream, and writes this part of his Book to be revenged of that Proposition which affrighted him; if they do or did, I wish they had or would cleanse their Sermons or Discourses from such Ambiguous terms as can minister only to vain jangling. I profess, I do never in this controversie hear these terms of *material* and *formal cause*, without some regret; I must sometimes use them, but

but it is full sore against my will; and commonly I take as much care to qualifie them, as the Physician doth to correct poyson. Bishop *Prideaux* asks, *Quis unquam è nostris nos per justitiam Christi imputatam formaliter justificari asserit.* Yet Bishop *Davenant* saith, *Hæc communis est nostrorum omnium sententia, Christi Obedientiam & Justitiam nobis imputatam esse formalem causam Justificationis. De Just. Habit.* p. 312. I suppose the great repute and authority of this *learned Prelate* hath trepanned some of our Preachers to say as he said: Why doth Mr. *Sh.* stand pelting at *poor Conventicles*? Why doth he not take up his Latine Pen and confute *Davenant*? or if he be more ready and fluent in English, there's Bishop *Downham* (the great *Commentator* on *Ramus*, and therefore the more like to understand Logical terms) who makes not the *Righteousness imputed*, but the *imputation of it the formal cause of Justification*? let him try a fall with him, and if he do fairly lay him on his back, the day is his own. But still the *generality* of *Non-conformists* are *in statu quo*, out of danger, having never either said or dreamed that Christs Righteousness is the *formal-cause* of our *justification*. In putting Mr. *Sh.* upon dealing with the two great Bishops, you must not think that I put him to use a weapon at which he hath no skill; for he is a *great School-man*, well acquainted not only with their *sayings*, but with their very *thoughts*; for *p.* 303. he tells Dr. *Owen*, *He gives such an explication of the term* Quâ, *as the subtilest Schoolman of them all ne-*

ver yet thought of. Belike he hath some secret and familiar converses with the *seperate* Souls of the *subtilest Schoolmen*, and correspondence by Letters with those who are still alive; and they acquaint him what have been and are their thoughts about the particle *Quâ*; and they unanimously tell him that it never came into their minds to explicate this Proposition, *An Embassadour eats and drinks as an Embassadour*; thus, *He who is an Embassadour eateth and drinketh.* If indeed he hath any such way to know what have been the thoughts of the *Schoolmen* concerning *Quâ*, I'le not contradict him, nor do I envy him his correspondencies. We begin every day less and less to stand in need of the *Schoolmen*, but I am sure if the *Schoolmen* that are most *subtile* have acquainted him, that they never thought of any such explication of *Quâ* as is before mentioned, they have played the *Hypocrites* most egregiously; for divers and sundry of them explaining the vulgar *distinction* of *Quâ*, *Specificativum* and *Reduplicativum*, do give us just such a sence of the *specificative* As, as is here by Mr. *Sh.* rejected and derided. Thus they say, *Plato as he is white* is a *Philosopher*, is true *specificatively*; as is this also, *Christ as Man* is to be worshipped with the Worship called *Latria:* But yet both these Propositions are false, *Quâ* being taken *Reduplicatively.* It is like Mr. *Sh.* will say, That the *Schoolmen* who do expound *Quâ* to such a sence, speak very loosely and improperly; and so say I too, but I am apt to suppose that they did speak as

they

they thought; and though I ſhould either reject this diſtinction, or give a better explication of the members of it, yet if I find any one expreſſing his mind, as many have done before him, I will not throw him my Glove, or ſend him a challenge, or poſt him up for an *Ignoramus*.

Pag. 326. "Now as the Death of Chriſt upon the Croſs, and his Aſcenſion into Heaven, and preſenting his Blood to God in that true Holy Place, did anſwer to the firſt ſprinkling of the Blood under the Law, which confirmed the *Moſaical* Covenant, as the Apoſtle diſcourſeth *Heb.* 4. ſo his continual interceſſion for us in the vertue of his Blood once ſhed, and once offered to God, anſwers to thoſe frequent Expiations by Sacrifice under the Law, eſpecially to that grand Sacrifice on the great Day of Expiation, when the High Prieſt entred into the Holy of Holies with the Blood of Beaſts.

So exact a man as Mr. *Sh.* ſhould not have expreſſed theſe things ſo much at random. He ſhould have told us how and when *Chriſt preſented his blood to God in the true Holy place*, and told us what he means by the *firſt ſprinkling of blood under the Law*, & how Chriſts *continual Interceſſions for us anſwer to the frequent Expiations by Sacrifice under the Law, eſpecially to the general Sacrifice on the great day of Expiation*; and if he can give us a true and plain Explication of the whole *Ninth* to the *Hebrews*, and not entangle himſelf, nor pull down ſome of the things he had built up, I will

ſay he is a moſt wonderfull man, excelling all the *Syſtematiſts* I know of.

Pag. 389. "A ſincere Obedience to the Go-"ſpel makes a real Union between Chriſt and "us. (I ſhould think that a Purpoſe of ſincere Obedience makes the Union, and actual ſincere Obedience is an Evidence or Effect of our Union; but let that paſs.) He addes, "There is no more need of any Revelation of "any private Teſtimony of the Spirit, to aſ-"ſure us that we are united, or that we obey "ſincerely, than there is to aſſure us of any "thing which is evident to our outward or "inward ſenſes.

This will not down without ſome chewing. I never heard of any man that deſired a *teſtimony of the Spirit* for any thing which was *evident to his outward ſenſe*: if it were *evident* that meat was on his Table, Mr. *Sh.* I deem never prayed that the *Spirit would teſtifye* that there was Meat on the Table; but his Heart is deceitfull, the courſe of his Obedience is often interrupted by Acts of ſin, and every Act of Obedience is imperfect; if this notwithſtanding the ſincerity of his Obedience be *ſo evident* to him, as what is *moſt evident*, he hath ſuch peace and joy in Believing as few men have, no men that I converſe with; and this Concluſion, *I William Sherlock am really united to Chriſt*, is to him a *Concluſion de fide*. For thus I frame his Syllogiſm, *Every one that ſincerely obeyes is really united to Chriſt*; *I William Sherlock ſincerely obey*, Ergo, *I am really united to Chriſt*. The *minor* is as evident

to

to him, as that his Surplice is white; but so I trow is not the *major*, which is a Scripture Proposition, an *Article de fide*, therefore his Conclusion must be *de Fide*, as following the less evident Premisse.

Pag. 399. He takes on him to correct the Notions of some men concerning the Love of Christ, and saith, that with them, "The Love "of Christ is a Love to the Person of a Be-"liever, without considering any other Quali-"fications, than that he is such an individual "Person: The meaning whereof he makes to be this, That "the Excellency of Christs Love "consists in this, that he loves for no Rea-"son.

Who the men be that have so expressed themselves, I no more know, than I know what the *Pope* of *Rome* is doing while I write. All that ever were in any reputation for Learning and Sobriety, say, That Christ in pardoning a Believer, and hearing his Prayers, hath *respect* unto Qualifications; he pardoneth him because he is *meet* for Pardon, because he is a *Penitent*, because he *hateth sin, confesseth, forsaketh sin*, can *forgive* those who have sinned against him; in a word, because he is one, who by vertue of Gods gracious Covenant hath a *right* to Pardon. But why did Christ give Repentance to one, and not to another? because he belonged to the Fathers Election: but why did the Father elect this man, and not another? onely because it pleased him. Methinks Mr. *Sh.* might allow *God to be mercifull because he will be mercifull*, and to shew some Acts of Love to *one* Person

which he doth not shew to *others*; because it *seemeth good in his eyes*, and not impute folly to him for *doing with his own what he listeth*. It was an act of love in *Christ* to lay down his life for men; what was the reason of this love? what moved him to lay down his life for them, and not for the Angels? It was an act of love in *Christ* to send the *Gospel* to us *Britains*, sooner by many years than to other Nations; what reason can any one give of this love? If the Histories of *God*'s Providence be not all false, he hath let the light of his *Gospel* shine among some that lived a very lewd and profligate life, by which means they have some of them been brought to the knowledge of the Truth into other places, that were better governed; light came not, or at least came not till some of those who used their Talent of Nature better than most, were gone to their graves.

Pag. 414, 415. Mr. *Sh.* falls on the bones of Mr. *W. B.* (or perhaps only of some ignorant Transcriber, or careless Printer) for some expressions relating to *our love to the Person of Christ*. The words quarrelled (though not the only words liable to exception) are these. *It is a more excellent thing to love the Person of Christ, than the benefits of Christ; a more excellent thing to have my heart drawn out in love to the Person of Christ, than to have my heart drawn out in love to him for his benefits. What* (saith Mr. *Sh.*) *can be the meaning of all this, but that the excellency and perfection of our love to Christ consists in our loving him for no reason; the proper object and reason of love is Goodness,*

ness, to love that which is good for nothing, is the folly and degeneracy of love; and it is as foolish and impossible a task to love a Person, who hath been good to us, not because he hath been good, but for no reason. Now this is the case here, &c.

He that will spend much time to set things right betwixt Mr. *W. Bridges* his Ghost, and Mr. *W. Sh.* doth not set any very great price upon his time. I for my part am not wont in my communings with my own heart, to vex my self with *Metaphysical* niceties; If I can but find, that I love *God*, so as that I dare not, cannot disobey him, I am quiet. But Mr. *Sh.* I perceive is profoundly *Metaphysical*, intimately acquainted with the writings and thoughts of *Schoolmen*, especially those who were most subtle among them. I shall give him the pleasure and recreation of propounding some difficulties relating to his discourse of love.

1. Whether *God* did not from all Eternity love himself?
2. Whether in that love he did consider himself as doing good, or bestowing benefits on himself, or others?
3. If he did not so consider himself, whether he loved himself for no reason?
4. Whether there be any goodness in what is *meerly possible*, but *shall never* be?
5. If there be any goodness in what is *meerly possible*, whether the ground of *God's* love to it be good, it doth to *himself*, or *others?*

6. What is the *Ground*, *Object*, *Reason* of *God*'s love to the *Creature*?
7. Whether the *Creature* be bound to love the *Creator* more than the *Creature*?
8. Whether the *benefits* we receive from *God*, be not *created* beings?
9. Whether if the *benefits we receive from God*, be the *sole* or *chief ground* of our loving *God*, we do not either love the *Creature* more than the *Creator*, or not love the *Creator at all*?

These are knots which Mr. *Sh.* can easily untye; for what is there that can be difficult to him who hath all his *Philosophy* at his fingers end?

In the mean time I must conclude these advertisements, which you had never seen, if so be those on the first Chapter put into the form of a Letter at your importunity, had not been far beyond the time allowed by you or me, deteined in the Countrey. Upon the whole I think, Mr. *Sh.* should not have thrown so many stones at *other mens* writings, till he had took care to make *his own* less faulty. He might if he had pleased have chosen other *Subjects* and *Persons* on whom to exercise his *Juvenile* Pen. I verily believe his book will not occasion any one man to live a better life, or to look on *Fanaticks* with the worse eye.

You will say all this while I have said very little in defence of those whom Mr. *Sh.* impugnes.

I confeſs I have ſaid but a little, and yet I have ſaid more than I intended, and more than was needful; for what if every paſſage in ſome mens popular diſcourſes will not bear a ſevere tryal by the *Rules of Art*? is this any diſparagement to the cauſe of *Non-conformiſts*? Cannot I find paſſages in the *Homilies* of the *Fathers*, that would make good ſport, if any one would be at the pains to lay them together, and play upon them? Or have any of our late ſo much *famed Writers* againſt the *Papiſts*, took ſo much care to put out their Books, as never to ſtand in need of a very candid Reader? He that *Preacheth oft*, and *Printeth much*, may do no more than what he thinks himſelf in Conſcience bound to do; but it is a thouſand to one, he will in many things lay himſelf open.

Ay, but the men whom Mr. *Sh.* pincheth, do profeſſedly avow ſuch principles as *naturally tend to make men bad*, or *hinder and retard their progreſs in true holineſs*.

Anſ. If his deſign were only to expoſe opinions that *naturally tend to make men bad*, *or*, &c. it was very laudable; and if his *Conſcience* do clearly witneſs that he had no other deſign, he hath the leſs to anſwer, though he hath failed in the managing of his deſign. But,

1. Before he charge any opinion, he ought fairly to ſtate, and candidly to repreſent that opinion. This I ſeldome find him to do, and if I had ſaid I never found him ſo to have done, I ſhould not *lye*, though perhaps I might be *miſtaken*.

2. He

2. He ought never to charge any man with those *consequences of an opinion* which he knows to be *disowned* and *disavowed* by him; for though he who writes against an *opinion*, is to burden it with all the *consequences* which do naturally flow from it; yet is not he who maintains the *opinion*, to be represented forthwith, as one who *avows* all those consequences. Indeed it were to no purpose to dispute against any man by urging the *consequences* flowing from his *opinion*; if he did *own* those consequences, in vain it would be, I mean as to the man himself who *owns* the consequences, though perhaps not in vain, as to every one of those whom he had proselyted to his opinion.

3. He sins against *God* and his *Neighbour* every time he draws a *bad* sense out of words that are capable of a *good* sence. How often he hath polluted his Conscience this way, may easily be discerned; I shall give one instance for all, *pag.* 379, 380. he layeth it to the charge, "of some men, that they do so magnifie the attainments of Hypocrites, who "shall never go to Heaven; that it is impossible "for any sanctified man to do more than an "Hypocrite may do. If there be any men who so do, they are to be withstood, as *adversaries to all Christian Consolation in this world.* But who are the men that so do? why, Mr. *Shepheard* doth so; and will the *Conscience* of this *Minister of the Gospel* suffer him to charge that upon men which is found only for ought appears in Mr. *Shepeheard.* If Mr. *Shepeheard* through a zeal without knowledge, have indeed made

made those things common to *Hypocrites*, which are proper only to *Sound Believers*, and *sincere Christians*, he must bear his own burden; and less understanding. Readers are to be cautioned that they prejudice not themselves by his writings; but what is this to others who contributed nothing to the making or Printing his Book, and perhaps never saw his Book? So *pag.* 37, *&c.* He tells us of "an acquaintance "with the Person of Christ, which if we will "believe some men, is the only fountain of "saving knowledge, this acquaintance he after-"wards makes to be such an acquaintance as is "not to be got or attained to by the Gospel; "yea, which is contrary to that acquaintance "we can get from the Gospel. Are there some men who make *such an acquaintance with Christ's Person, the sole fountain of saving knowledge?* I never saw any such, never read of any such, and hope there are none such in the world; Mr. *Sh.* thinks there be: and how doth he prove it? Why, *J. O. D.D.* in a Book Entituled, of *Com. with Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, hath some expressions which if they be set on the Rack, and construed to a sence that it is manifest he never intended, may seem to hold forth *such an acquaintance with the Person of Christ*; and this is sufficient to this *Rector of St. George Buttolph-Lane*, to charge on a party of men so vile a principle; this is sufficient to warrant him to call Mr. *Shepeheard* (who 'tis like never heard of Dr. *Owen*, and to be sure was dead before his Book of *Communion* came forth) by way of Scorn, a great acquaintance of Christ. Well,

Well, but let us imagine yet Mr. *Sher.* had charged Mr. *Shepheards* sayings only on Mr. *Shepheard*, and try whether he hath done him no wrong in what he chargeth upon him. I say he hath manifestly, laying to him such faults as it doth not appear he was ever guilty of. Mr. *T.S.* stands charged as one that so *magnifies the attainments of Hypocrites, that it is impossible for any sanctified man to do more than he may do.* To make this good, he is brought in answering the pleas which several Hypocrites make for themselves: and Mr. *Sher.* supposeth the same man to make all these pleas for himself, which is not fair or just. Let's hear the *Pleas*, and the *Answers to them.*

Plea. *I have left my sins I once lived in, and am now no Drunkard, no Swearer, no Lyar.* Mark, it is not supposed that he hath left all the sins he once lived in.

Answ. *Be washed from all the mire (the pollution of the world) and yet be a Swine in God's account.*

This I say is a truth, a man may be *washed from the pollution of the world, and yet be a Swine in God's account*; that is, his outward conversation may be so altered, as that he shall cease to act and practise those things which the *Apostle* calls the *Pollutions of the world*, and yet his *heart* be still *unclean*, and so remain *a Swine in Gods account*, for God esteemeth him a *Swine* who is not *cured* of his *swinish disposition*, though he be so *restrained* as that he doth not *wallow in the mire*. Ay, but Mr. *T.S.* proves this from 2 *Pet.* 2. 20. which is *point blank*

blank contrary to what he Affirms. That is, it is *point blank contrary*, if we will take Mr. *Sh*'s word, but we will look for a proof before we yield any point blank contrariety.

Plea. *I Pray, and that often.*

Anſ. *So thou mayeſt, and yet never be ſaved,* Iſa. 1. 11. *To what purpoſe is the multitude of your Sacrifices?*

That Mr. *S. H.* may Maſter this Objection, he ſuppoſeth the man who ſo pleadeth to live, *a blameleſs, innocent, honeſt, ſmooth life*; and then replyeth, that Sacrifices when offered by *ſuch*, are ſure to *great* purpoſe, and that the want of ſuch a life, made thoſe *Sacrifices abominable to God.* But it may be queſtioned whether Mr. *T. S.* ſuppoſed the man who *prayed often*, to be of a *blameleſs*, *innocent*, *honeſt*, *ſmooth life*; yet if he had made that ſuppoſition, his anſwer may be *good* and *perſinent*; for if a man's life be *blameleſs*, &c. if it be not ſo with *relation to God and Men*, and in *every thing*, his Prayers may avail nothing.

Plea. *But I faſt ſometimes.*

Anſ. *So did the Scribes and Phariſees twice a week.*

Reply. It was to *devour Widows houſes*, which was not the faſt of an honeſt innocent man. It is then granted, that a *very groſs Hypocrite may faſt ſometimes*, which is enough to juſtifie Mr. *T. Sh.* But where did Mr. *Sh.* learn that the *Scribes and Phariſees did faſt twice a week to devour widows houſes*; or that on thoſe *faſting dayes they made longer Prayers than other men?* Yea, how doth he prove that the *Phariſees de-*

voured

voured widows houſes? In *Mark* and *Luke* this is charged only on the *Scribes*. And though it be charged on the *Phariſees*, *Matth.* 23. 14. yet there is ſome queſtion made by learned men whether that Verſe be not thruſt into *Matthew*. Mr. *Sh.* ſhall do well to correct *Grotius* and *Brugenſis*, to aſſert the *Authentity* of thoſe *Greek Copies* which our *Tranſlators* follow; and then he may with more confidence ſay the *Phariſees made long Prayers to devour widows houſes*, yet if he will ſay ſo before he hath taken ſuch pains, I will not reprove him; for I am no advocate of *Phariſees*.

Plea. *I hear the Word of God, and like the beſt Preachers.* Anſ. *So did the ſtony Ground, who heard the Word with joy, and for a ſeaſon believed.*

Mr. *Sh*'s reply to this, is wonderfully delivered in theſe words, *This had been well, and a good ſign of grace if it had continued.* That is, the *diſpoſition* which was in the *hearers* compared to the *ſtony ground*, was a *good ſign of Grace* whil'ſt it *continued*, but by *not continuing* it became *no ſign of Grace*: Before the *ſcorching Sun* came, the *ſtony ground* was *good ground*, as well as *ſowed with good ſeed.* What is the reſult of this? why,

----------Ultima ſemper
Expectanda dies homini eſt, ſanctúſque vocari
Ante obitum nemo, ſupremáque funera debet.

Suppoſe a man doubting of his condition, ſhould come to Mr. *Sh.* and tell him, that he rejoyceth

joyceth in the Word, and believeth; he will anſwer, this is a *good ſign of grace if it continue*; but how ſhall I know whether it *will continue?* that will appear when tribulation or perſecution comes, becauſe of the Word of the Kingdom, till then hope the beſt. How well this will ſatisfie a man that is concerned for his Soul, we may eaſily gueſs; none of the *Nonconformiſts* whom he ſo much ſcorns, would have ſent away a doubting Chriſtian with ſo *unſatisfactory* an anſwer, they can eaſily out of God's Word, lay down Characters by which the *joy* and *faith* of an *Hypocrite* may be diſcerned, before the *Hypocrite* quite falls from either.

Plea. *I read the Scripture often.*

Anſ. *So did the Phariſees, who were ſo perfect in the Bible, that Chriſt needed but to ſay, It hath been ſaid of old times, for they knew the Text without intimation.*

If theſe be Mr. *T. S*'s words (which having not the book by me, I cannot examine) he much miſtook himſelf; for as it may be queſtioned whether *Chriſt* ever ſaid, *it hath been ſaid of old times*; ſo it is certain that that form of ſpeech which he uſed, however to be rendred, was ſpoken not to the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, but to his *own Diſciples*, whom we muſt account *generally* good. But the *Divinity* is good, he who reads the Scripture often may be an *Hypocrite*? what is it that Mr. *Sh.* objects or adverteth. Firſt, he ſcoffingly ſaith, *Men of prodigious Memories certainly, better than any Concordance.* Doth he indeed think that

that they must be *men of prodigious Memories* that can *tell the Text without intimation*; if so, the *Jewish* Nation abounded with many *prodigies*, for that there were many in it, who if they had been at hand were better than any *Concordance* for the *Hebrew* Text, I suppose he doth not doubt. His answer is still behind, *Though Knaves may read the Scriptures, and be never the better for it; yet good men may read it to good purpose, and therefore I hope reading the Scripture is no argument that a man is a Hypocrite, because the Pharisees were.* This *hope* is such as he need not be ashamed of, but he shall do well to take shame to himself, for endeavouring to put a man famed for Piety, into a Fools Coat, to see whether he can make people laugh at him. O! that he would before it be too late, commune with his own heart, and search the *Scriptures* to see whether this *Drollery* becomes a *Preacher*.

Plea. *I am grieved and sorrowful, and repent of my sins.*

Ans. *So did Judas.* What saith Mr. *Sh.* to the case of *Judas*? why, that he *hanged himself*, and that indeed was no *repentance unto life*. Indeed the *repentance* of *Judas* was no *repentance unto life*; nor did Mr. *T. S.* say it was, but brought it as an instance of a repentance *not* unto life. And I wish all pretending to be the *Sons of the Church*, would well consider what the *Homily* saith of *Judas* his *repentance*: 2d. *part of the Sermon of Repentance.* It might perhaps move some of them to alter their apprehensions about the Nature of Repentance, and

and not take up with such a Repentance as is so far short of what *Judas* did. In the mean time I am glad to find Mr. *Sh.* acknowledging that *Judas* hanged himself, because the *immortal Hugh Groot* goes quite another way, as also do *Heinsius*, *De Dieu*, Dr. *Lightfoot*; it seems this *Rector* is not alway out of conceit with that Translation he reads to the People. I wish by minding him, that *late Criticks* deny *Judas to have hanged himself*, I have not laid a stone of offence in his way.

Plea. *But I love good men and their company.*

An. *So did the foolish Virgins.* What jest hath Mr. *Sh.* to break upon this? (for he is not in the mood of giving serious replies) why this, *The foolish Virgins slept, and suffered their Lamps to go out, which I hope all that love good men do not.* If he hope there are *any* good men who do not sleep, he hopes there be some wiser than *any* of the *five wise Virgins*; as for not letting their Lamps go quite out, Mr. *Th. S.* will allow him not only to *hope* it of some good men, but also to *affirm* it of every good man.

Plea. *God hath given me much knowledge.*

Ans. *That thou mayest have, and never be saved.* Mr. *Sh.* denyes not this; but adds, *If a blameless honest man have the keeping of this knowledge, it is never the worse for him*; which if you mark it well, is an huge Commendation of *good knowledge*, that a man is *not the worse for it.*

Anſ. *So did the Jews, whom yet Chriſt condemneth.* Here Mr. *T. S.* ſtumbled, and Mr. *Sh.* muſt needs call to all *England* to take notice of it; But the anſwer though unhappily expreſſed, is ſufficient to ſhew that a man may ſtrictly keep a day of Divine Inſtitution, and yet be of the number of thoſe whom *Chriſt* condemns. But hath not Mr. *Sh.* committed a greater miſtake in ſaying, that to keep the Lords Day ſtrictly is one good thing, which doth well in the company of more? ſuch a Speech would formerly have been eſteemed *Puritanical*, and it may be this, notwithſtanding he could like well enough of a *Book of Sports*. 2. In implying that *with other things, it will juſtifie a man*; for as I think, it is *God*, and not the *Obſervation of the Lords Day* that *juſtifieth*.

I am aſhamed to obſerve how in the remainder of *p.* 382, and *pag.* 383. throughout Mr. *Sh.* ſhews his teeth, and knoweth not where to bite; juſt like a man that wiſheth his adverſary had errors to be confuted, and were ſorry he could find none.

That *a man may think he hath a good heart to God, and yet deceive himſelf*, which is all that Mr. *Shepeheard* ſaith, he cannot deny, but wiſheth he had ſaid, *that a man who thinks he hath a good heart towards God, muſt needs be miſtaken*; and then he would ſay, *the whole Doctrine concerning marks and evidences were at an end.*

It may perhaps be worthy a little obſervation, what Mr. *Sh.* ſaith, to a *diſtinguiſhing* mark betwixt

betwixt a *regenerate* and an *unregenerate* man. *An unregenerate man*, saith T. S, *let him go never so far, do never so much, yet he lives in some one sin or other.* This I say is a good Rule for a man to judge himself by: He that allows himself in no known sin either of *Omission* or *Commission*, is a *regenerate* man: Every *unregenerate* man allows himself in some *known* sin of *omission* or *commission*. A *Regenerate* person hates every known sin, and sincerely endeavours to avoid all known sin, so *doth* no *unregenerate* man, so *can* no *unregenerate* man doe: no man not born of *God*, loves *God* above all; there is something he loves above *God*, and what the effect of not loving *God* above all must needs be, who knows not? Mr. *Sh.* it should seem doth not, for he saith, this is very strange, *That let an unregenerate man go never so far, and doe never so much, yet he lives in some one sin or other.* If it seem *strange*, *very strange*, I cannot help it; but a little *Christian Philosophy* will take away the admiring Humour.

Lastly, It is manifest that Mr. *Sh.* thrusts out his sting against those who have written nothing (taken notice of by him) that can be supposed to hurt or hinder Godliness. He mentions *Thomas Vincent*, p. 144. censureth the *prettiness and fantastical Wit of an Exhortation made by him*: What is the *Exhortation*? why the *Exhortation* is directed to his Hearers, *To choose Christ for their Husband, because he is Rich, Beautifull and Kind, and hath all the Properties of an excellent Husband. This* he saith, *would sound better in a Popish Nun-*

very, than among such pretenders to Reformation. One mans Exhortation doth not please him, but he cannot content himself to declare his displeasure against one man; we presently hear of *pretenders to Reformation, not so generous suitors for Christ as the Papists.* To the reproach of my stupidity, I cannot see what *prettiness* or *fantasticalness is in this Wit*, if *wit* it must be called. I ever took it for granted, that in *sound* Conversion a man is taken into a *conjugal Relation with Christ*, and that if any man so related to *Christ* should fall into an Act of *Idolatry*, he should commit *spiritual Adultery*, and would provoke God to jealousie. This *young Divine* is so illuminated that he can *correct Magnificat*, and spy a *beam* in Expressions so usual among the greatest *Clerks*, and so agreeable to *Scripture*; let us see what Discovery he hath made. *The Church is Christs Spouse, and every Christian is a member of that Society which Christ owns for his Spouse: He is a great Enemy to Polygamy, and hath but one Spouse, as he hath but one Body, but one Church.* If Mr. *Vincent* should grant all this to be true, his Exhortation is not at all spoyled; Maids are still to be perswaded to *choose Christ to be their Husband*, onely it seems they must first choose to be *members of the Church*, and then they shall be *parts* of the *Spouse of Christ*. But I should think, that as his *Majesty* by being *King of England, Scotland, Ireland*, is *King* to *every* Person in these three Kingdoms; so Christ by being *Husband* to his *Church*, hath the Relation of an *Husband* to *every* member of the *Church*.

Church. It is the *Church* of *Christ* that is called the *Spouse* in the *Canticles*, and the *Wife* of the *Lamb* in the *Revelations*; but why is she so called, but because she is a *collection* of such *men* and *women* as are *married* or *espoused* to him. The *Church* which is married to *Christ* is also *married* to his *Father*, is so his *Wife* that she is also his *Mother*, and yet *Christ* is as great an Enemy to *Incest* as *Polygamy*. Let us leave it to *Julian* to *scoffe* at these *Titles* and *Relations*; and for our own parts, let us *admire* at the *condescensions* of *Divine love*, and conceive of things *spiritual spiritually*, so shall we be accounted worthy to be *called to the Marriage of the Lamb*, and be brought by him into his Fathers House, which he hath prepared for all that fear him.

I have now done, and desire you to keep these Papers to your self; or if you will needs shew them to Mr. *Sh.* to conceal my Name; for I love not to enter into the Lists with any man, and he hath already Adversaries enow. And if you will, you may please to acquaint him with the *misadventures* of some men of *wit*, but of no great *judgement* in *Divinity*. *Vergerius* was a *witty* man, else he had not been made *Legate* to *Clement* the seventh, and *Paul* the third; he setting himself to write against the *Apostates* of *Germany*, became by reading their Books, their Convert, and so quite lost the Hope he had of a *Cardinalship*: *Pighius* adventuring to read *Calvin* about *Justification*, with a design to refute him, became a *Calvinist* in point

point of *Justification*, and that did not help him to Preferment. A *worthy* & *Right Reverend* Person, now one of his *Majesties Bishops*, preaching when he was young, for a Friend of yours and mine, very elegantly discoursed against the *Imputation of the active Righteousnesse*, in that sence which looks a little too like *Antinomianism*, our Friend told him, he had delivered but his sence, yet blamed him for that being so *young*, he would so *peremptorily* declare himself in a point wherein it was possible he might live to be of *another* mind. He replyed, That it could not be, he should alter his Mind in that matter; but setting himself afterwards to preach at large about *Justification*, he most *professedly pleaded* for the *Imputation of the Active Righteousnes*, and of that mind he is still. Commend to his Reading, three *Non-conformists*, Mr. *Fox*, *De Christo gratis justificante*; Mr. *Anthony Wotton*, *De Reconciliatione*, &c. Mr. *William Bradshaw*, *De Justificatione*. Bid him also consider, whether if the *Parliament* should meet, they might not find leisure enough to censure his Discourse, as they did Mr. *Mountagues*, who in vain pleaded for himself, That he he had writ against the *Puritans*, and was left alone to suffer, though others had instigated him to write. The *Commons* of *England* will scarce endure to find the *Doctrine* of the Church of *England* struck at, though it be through the sides of Dr. *Owen* and Dr. *James*. Nor can I think, that the *Reverend Fathers* of our *Church* read this Book of

Mr.

Mr. *Sh's.* without a Frown in their Foreheads; common Fame is more than ordinarily falſe, if ſome of them have not manifeſted their diſlike of it. Theſe things you may if you pleaſe ſuggeſt to your Author. Let *Brotherly Love* continue betwixt you and

Your, &c.

FINIS.

UMI